

REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel adhesive for single- or double-sided adhesive film strips that are redetachable without residue or destruction by extensive stretching.

Claims 1 -11 are pending.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because "tackifier resin" was recited twice. The claim has now been amended to cancel one of the instances of said recitation, and it is believed that this amendment obviates the rejection. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Groves US 5,623,010 in view of supporting evidence provided by TYZOR Technical Bulletin K-17591.

The Examiner refers to Examples 1-7 of Groves as disclosing an acid anhydride modified vinyl aromatic block copolymer (1) in addition to the acrylate resin of primer composition of composition 2.

Each of these blends comprises an acrylate component, however.

As previously pointed out to the Examiner, it is well known to use metal chelates, especially with titanium, for crosslinking acrylates. Therefore, those skilled in the art reading Examples 1-7 of the Groves reference would understand that it is the acrylate component of the Examples that is being crosslinked, and not the vinylaromatic block copolymer.

It is not known, or suggested anywhere, that vinylaromatic block copolymers could be crosslinked with metal chelates. Therefore Examples 1-7 of the reference, all of which include an acrylate component, could not possibly lead those skilled in the art to the crosslinking of vinylaromatic block copolymers themselves with metal chelates.

In order to more clearly distinguish Applicants' claims from the subject matter of the Groves reference, claim 1 has been amended to specifically exclude acrylate-containing polyolefins. Acrylate-containing polyolefins are listed on page 7, line 18 of the specification as being among further additives which can be included in Applicants' adhesive. As provided by MPEP § 2173.05(i), If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims.

The Examiner cites the TIZOR bulletin to show that TIZOR additives can be used for crosslinking. However, if the Examiner will look at that section of the TIZOR bulleting entitled "Unique Mode of Action", he will see that the TIZOR additives act through "common functional groups", such as -OH, -COOH and SiOH etc.

Applicants' vinyl aromatic block copolymers do not have any of such functional groups.

Accordingly, no person skilled in the art would see the TIZOR additives as useful for crosslinking vinylaromatic block copolymers, since the necessary functional groups are not present.

Furthermore, the Examiner's contention at page 4 of the Office Action that:

"...the adhesive film strip is capable of detachable by extensive stretching in the direction of the bondline..." Referring to column 8, lines 60-66 and column 9, lines 1-6

Is simply not correct and reflects a miss-reading of what the reference discloses. At column 8, line 60 to column 9, line 6, the reference merely teaches that the adhesive is removable by peeling (as are almost all adhesive tapes). Absolutely nothing is taught or suggested about the use of Applicants' claimed adhesive in an adhesive tape that is re-detachable by extensive stretching in the direction of the bondline.

Applicants' claims cannot therefore be seen as obvious over the Groves/TIZOR combination of references, and the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Groves US 5,623,010 in view of supporting evidence provided by TYZOR Technical Bulletin K-17591 should therefore now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Groves US 5,623,010 in view of Graham US 4,005,247. The

differences between Applicants' claims and anything that could be derived from the Groves reference are discussed above. The Examiner turns to the Graham reference for a teaching of an acrylic interpolymers that reacts with a metal chelate to form a crosslinked polymer matrix.

Here again, however, an acrylate, which is known to be crosslinkable with a chelate, is present. Nothing in Graham would teach or suggest that a styrene block copolymer could be crosslinked with a metal chelate.

Accordingly, no combination of Groves and Graham could possibly render Applicants' claims obvious, and the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Groves US 5,623,010 in view of Graham US 4,005,247 should now be withdrawn.

Applicants' note the Examiner's comment, in paragraph 29 on page 13, of the office action, that the objection to the specification, although repeated has been withdrawn. It seems that if it has been withdrawn there was no need to repeat it, and no need to respond to it. Applicants' presume that the objection to the specification has been disposed of and therefore will not respond further. If, however, it is still present please inform the undersigned and an appropriate response will be filed.

Applicants will also review the Information Disclosure Statement and file such further papers as appears necessary or appropriate under the circumstances.

In view of the present remarks it is believed that claims 1 -11 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By: /William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmh

875 Third Avenue, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844